

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

RONNIE BLANCH,) Case No. 2:15-cv-00450-GMN-NJK
Plaintiff(s),) ORDER
vs.) (Docket No. 25)
CLARK COUNTY DETENTION CENTER, et al.,)
Defendant(s).)

Pending before the Court is Plaintiff's second motion for appointment of counsel. Docket No. 25. Defendants have not yet appeared in this case. The Court finds this motion properly decided without a hearing. *See* Local Rule 78-2. For the reasons discussed below, the motion is hereby

DENIED.

Chief United States District Judge Gloria M. Navarro previously denied Plaintiff's motion for appointment of counsel in this case. Docket No. 5 at 7-8. As such, Plaintiff's motion is more properly framed as one seeking reconsideration. Motions for reconsideration are disfavored. *E.g., Kabo Tools Co. v. Porauto Indus. Co.*, 2013 WL 5947138, *2 (D. Nev. Oct. 31, 2013) (citing *Japan Cash Mach. Co. v. Mei, Inc.*, 2008 U.S. Dist. Lexis 98778, *7 (D. Nev. Nov. 20, 2008)). "Reconsideration is appropriate if the district court (1) is presented with newly discovered evidence; (2) committed clear error or the initial decision was manifestly unjust; or (3) if there is an intervening change in controlling law." *Kabo Tools*, 2013 WL 5947138, at *2 (quoting *Frasure v. United States*, 256 F. Supp. 2d 1180, 1183 (D. Nev. 2004)).

In this instance, Plaintiff argues that this is a complex case in which Plaintiff is not able to adequately present his claims. *See* Docket No. 25 at 1-2. In particular, Plaintiff argues that there may be conflicting testimony and it will be necessary to obtain testimony from a doctor and chiropractor regarding Plaintiff's medical condition. *See id.* The Court finds these additional considerations insufficient to reconsider the previous determination that appointment of counsel is not proper in this case.

Accordingly, the motion for reconsideration is **DENIED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: April 4, 2016

NANCY J. KOPPE
United States Magistrate Judge